From: Miller, Garyg
To: Sanchez, Carlos

Subject: RE: Documentation on San Jacinto River Flooding

Date: Wednesday, April 02, 2014 4:06:00 PM

Sounds good – will do.

Gary Miller
EPA Remedial Project Manager
214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov

From: Sanchez, Carlos

Sent: Wednesday, April 02, 2014 3:31 PM

To: Miller, Garyg

Subject: RE: Documentation on San Jacinto River Flooding

Gary,

In talking with John, he suggested that we get an internal review group to look at the alternatives and preferred alternative and get their input.

He suggested Gary B, Jon, Vince, others, to do a peer review/brain storming discussion.

Also, although it is not a sediment site, he suggest that we run it through Steve Ells group and get a quick review and recommendations from that group. Maybe just a small group from Steve's office could look at it. The more peope/groups we run it through, the better we will be when we decide on a remedy. CAS

From: Miller, Garyg

Sent: Wednesday, April 02, 2014 10:25 AM

To: Stephen Ellis; Allen, Bob (PCS); Linda Henry; Garry McMahan; Schroeder, Paul R ERDC-RDE-EL-MS;

Jane Sarosdy; Barth, Edwin; Becher, Kent

Cc: Sanchez, Carlos; Turner, Philip; Foster, Anne; Salinas, Amy; Werner, Robert; Walters, Donn

Subject: Documentation on San Jacinto River Flooding

Folks,

Please consider the following in your reviews of the San Jacinto Feasibility Study and the relative merits of the alternatives:

Here are several reports about the severity of flooding on the San Jacinto River. A concern is potential scour near the waste pits. Please see p. 38 of the NTSB report regarding the 1994 storm (approximate 100-year flood event) that notes there was 10 to 12-feet of scour just south of the I-10 bridge. Comparing this to the model predicted scour for a 100-year storm, the Feasibility Study Report, Appendix A, Figure 2-6, "Spatial Distribution of Predicted Net Erosion During 100-Year Flood", the San Jacinto model predicts no more than 25 cm (about 10") in the same area where 10 to 12-feet of scour actually happened.

EPA has guidance on design of armor layer caps (GUIDANCE FOR IN-SITU SUBAQUEOUS CAPPING OF CONTAMINATED SEDIMENTS: Appendix A: Armor Layer Design) – here is a link: http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/sediment/iscmain/appnda.pdf

On page A-1, it states: "Factors pertinent to flood flows, navigation effects, and wind wave induced currents are presented and then formulas and sample calculations are provided. Less predictable forces on ISC (in-site capping) such as scouring from ice and debris, flow from velocities generated by channel blockages such as ice dams, or massive

bank failure are not evaluated by this analysis. Designers of ISC should consider the significance of these forces and potential effects in the evaluation of the feasibility of ISC."

Regarding the 1994 flood, the NTSB report states (p. 2) that:

"By any measure, the flooding of October 1994 was an extreme and dangerous event. Historical peak stream flows were exceeded at 23 of the 43 stations monitored in the area. The 100-year-flood, which is defined as the peak stream flow having a 1 percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year, was equaled at 1 and exceeded at 18 of 43 stations. For those stations where the 100- year-flood was exceeded, the flood was from 1.1 to 2.9 times the 100-year-flood.

The flooding caused major soil erosion in the flood plain and river channel, including the creation of water channels outside the San Jacinto River bed. The flood waters scoured the riverbed and banks, destabilized roads and bridges, and inundated area homes. The largest new channel (approximately 510 feet wide and 15 feet deep) was created when the river cut through the Banana Bend oxbow just west of the Rio Villa Park subdivision. A second major channel cut through Banana Bend just north of the channel through the oxbow. Both these channels cut through areas where sand mining had been performed previously."

Thanks,

Gary Miller
EPA Remedial Project Manager
214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov